



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,631	06/27/2003	Edwin Bolduan	ZTP00P12060	9862
24131	7590	11/03/2005	EXAMINER	
LERNER AND GREENBERG, PA P O BOX 2480 HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480			STINSON, FRANKIE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/608,631

Applicant(s)

BOLDUAN ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16, 18 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-14, 16 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1746

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the mesh as claimed in claim 19, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1746

4. Claims 1-4, 7-12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Bochan (U. S. Pat. No. 3,009,343).

Re claims 1 and 12 for example, Bochan is cited disclosing a washing machine, comprising:

a housing (2);

a conveyor (35) disposed in said housing for moving laundry goods in a circulation along a closed loop path in said housing;

a suds application device (see col. 4, lines 9-31) at least partially disposed in said housing for applying suds to the laundry goods; and

a cleaning device (see col. 6, lines 1-8) at least partially disposed in said housing for removing dissolved dirt from the laundry goods; and

a pre-humidification device (35,39) for partially removing liquid from the laundry goods having a pair of roller (14, 27) through which the laundry goods are pulled.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bochan in view of Smull (U. S. Pat. No. 3,352,723.)

Claim 6 defines over Bochan only in the recitation of the conveyor having conveying states of stationary, constant speed and back and forth movement. Smull is cited disclosing in a conveyORIZED washing system, the arrangement of the conveyor having

Art Unit: 1746

the states as claimed (see col. 7, lines 15-33). It therefore would to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Bochan, to have the conveyor having conveying states as taught by Smull, for the purpose of customizing the washing process. Clearly it is old and well known to adjust the wash process dependent upon the type of dirt and the type of material being clean, i.e., heavy material like denim and light material like linen. The thicker material would obviously require a deeper cleaning and the type of soils (grass stains or body dirt) would also dictate the amount of time and the amount of cleaning solution etc. to be employed by the user.

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bochan. Claim 14 defines over Bochan only in the recitation of the supplying device supplying compressed air. Nonetheless, as claimed, no patentable distinction is deemed to exist between the compressed air supplying device as claimed, and the air supplying device (61) as taught by Bochan.

7. Claims 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manuel (U. S. Pat. No. 3,827,262) in view of Japan'098 (Japan 6-126098).

Re claim13, Manuel discloses a washing machine, comprising:

a housing;

a conveyor(14) disposed in said housing for moving laundry goods in a circulation in said housing (NOTE: circulation has been defined as "the transmission or passage of anything from place to place"; Random House college Dictionary, 1980);

a suds application (16, see col. 2, lines 47-52) device at least partially disposed in said housing for applying suds to the laundry goods and;

Art Unit: 1746

a cleaning device (18, 20, 24, 26) at least partially disposed in said housing for removing dissolved dirt from the laundry goods; and

a pre-dehumidification device (22) disposed in a given area of said circulation for at least partially removing liquid from the laundry goods;

said pre-dehumidification device having a sponge rubber; and

at least one roller (the core) for pressing the laundry goods against said sponge rubber; and

said sponge rubber being, at least during pressing, substantially guided parallel to a motion of the respective laundry goods that differs from the claim only in the recitation of the pre-dehumidification device employing an absorbable fleece. Japan'098 is cited disclosing in a pre-dehumidification device, the arrangement of employing an absorbable sponge rubber material for the dehydrating of laundry goods. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Manuel, to employ an absorbable material as taught by Japan'098, for the purpose of enhancing the removal of liquid from the laundry goods. It is old and well known to employ a sponge rubber material for liquid absorption.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bochan in view of Wilson et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 2,064,512).

Re claim 19, Bochan (as describe in paragraph 4 above) discloses a washing machine comprising:

a housing;

Art Unit: 1746

means for transporting laundry goods in a circulation along a closed looped path in said housing;

means for applying suds to the laundry goods; and

means for removing dissolved dirt from the laundry goods;

means for at least partially removing liquid from the laundry goods

disposed in a given area of said circulation, said means for at least partially removing liquid from the laundry goods having an air supplying device (61) for applying air to the laundry goods that differs from the claim only in the recitation of the partial liquid removing means having a mesh. Wilson is cited disclosing the mesh as claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Bochan, to employ a mesh mater as taught by Wilson, for the purpose of enhancing the flow of fluid through the laundry goods. This would allow for the passing of fluid completely through the laundry goods.

4. Claims 5 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, 16, 18 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, in regard to the remarks on the Manuel reference, namely that the sponge rubber in Manuel is made of a material that is resistance to moisture. Please note that applicant provides information for material known under the name of Armaflex®, while Manuel has discloses material known under the name of Armoflex® and therefore, the

Art Unit: 1746

brochure for Armaflex® is deemed immaterial. However, if applicant provides information for the disclosed Armoflex® material, consideration would be given.


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In Waldstein, Remington, Taran, Shaw, and Payet et al., note the treatment of laundry goods.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fls


FRANKIE L. STINSON
Primary Examiner
GROUP ART UNIT 1746